

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO	
10/613,409	07/03/2003	David J. Good	3023.PKG	4461	
759	90 09/26/2006		EXAM	INER	
Cynthia L. Foulke NATIONAL STARCH AND CHEMICAL COMPANY			SCHATZ, CHRISTOPHER		
10 Finderne Avenue			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
Bridgewater, N	J 08807-0500		1733		
				DATE MAILED: 09/26/2006	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		<i></i>	2
	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
Office Action Summan	10/613,409	GOOD ET AL.	
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Christopher T. Schatz	1733	
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	pears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address	
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING D - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailin earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tin will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from e, cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).	
Status .			
1) ⊠ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 25 J 2a) ⊠ This action is FINAL. 2b) □ This 3) □ Since this application is in condition for alloware closed in accordance with the practice under E	s action is non-final. nce except for formal matters, pro		٠
Disposition of Claims			
4) ☐ Claim(s) 1-10,12,13 and 22-26 is/are pending 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdra 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) 1-10,12,13 and 22-26 is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or and/or are subject.	wn from consideration.		
Application Papers		•	
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accomplicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Example 11.	cepted or b) objected to by the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. Settion is required if the drawing(s) is ob	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). jected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).	
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119			
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority document 2. Certified copies of the priority document 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority application from the International Burea * See the attached detailed Office action for a list	ts have been received. ts have been received in Applicati crity documents have been receive u (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	ion No ed in this National Stage	
Attachment(s)			
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Di 5) Notice of Informat F 6) Other:	ate	

FINAL REJECTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

- (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.
- 2. Claims 1-3, 8, 10, 12, 13 and 22-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated Mehaffy et al. (EP 0934990A1).

Claims 1-3, 8, 10, 12, and 13 are rejected for the same reasons as set forth in section 2 of the office action dated January 25, 2006. As to claim 22, Mehaffy et al. discloses an adhesive wherein the bonded heat stress value and the adhesive temperature are separated by 90 °F or less (paragraph 0033). As to claims 23-24, Mehaffy et al. discloses an adhesive which has an application viscosity of between about 800 cps and 1500 cps (Table 1). As to claim 25, Mehaffy et al. discloses an adhesive comprising an ethylene n-butyl acrylate copolymer (paragraph 0021).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Application/Control Number: 10/613,409

Art Unit: 1733

4. Claims 5 and 26 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Mehaffy et al.

Claim 5 is rejected for the same reasons as set forth in section 4 of the office action dated January 25, 2006. As to claim 26, the claim is a combination of claims 2, 4, and 5, and Mehaffy meets the limitations for the reasons discussed in section 4 of the office action dated January 25, 2006.

- 5. Claims 4 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mehaffy et al. for the same reasons as set forth in section 5 of the office action dated January 25, 2006.
- 6. Claims 6 and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mehaffy et al. as applied above, and further in view of Baetzold et al. '913 for the same reasons as set forth in section 6 of the office action dated January 25, 2006.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed July 25, 2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant states that Mehaffy discloses adhesives applied at a temperature of 249 °F, and that the application temperature and heat stress values of said applied adhesives are separated by more than 110 °F. Examiner respectfully disagrees. Applicant's argument relies solely on the example disclosed by Mehaffy. Examiner agrees that in the example of Table 1, the application temperature and the heat stress value are separated by more than 110 °F. However, applicant is respectfully referred to paragraphs 0008 and 0033, where the reference explicitly discloses that the adhesive can by applied at 200 °F. More specifically, paragraph 0033 discloses than the adhesive applied at 200 °F and has a heat stress value of 115 °F. Applicant is

Art Unit: 1733

respectfully notified that the disclosure of a reference is not limited to the methods disclosed by an example. Furthermore, examiner asserts that because Mehaffy discloses the *same adhesive* composition as the instant application as discussed in section 4 of the office action dated January 25, 2006, the adhesive of Mehaffy will necessarily have the same heat stress properties as the adhesive of the instant invention.

As claims 6 and 7, applicant is respectfully notified that Baetzold et al. is used only to illustrate that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to add a fragrance and/or energy absorbing to the adhesive of Mehaffy et al.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to **Christopher T. Schatz** whose telephone number is **571-272-1456**. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00-5:30, Monday -Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Richard Crispino can be reached on 571-272-1226. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Christopher T. Schatz

RICHARD CRISPINO '
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1700